

The Office Action, in paragraph 4, rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,924,594 to Ogura et al. (hereinafter "Ogura"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Ogura teaches the elements, as illustrated in Fig. 2, including an absorption film 211, a barrier layer 210, a protective electrode 209, a cathode 208, an electroluminescent layer 207, and an anode 202. The absorption film 211, is not an inorganic oxide, as asserted by the Office Action, and as positively recited in independent claim 1. Specifically, Ogura discloses that a metal used for the absorption film has a low work coefficient and must be easily oxidized. Therefore, the absorption film cannot be made from BaO<sub>2</sub> because BaO<sub>2</sub> is not easily oxidized.

Moreover, Ogura does not disclose that at least the surface of the second electrode facing the barrier layer comprises an inorganic oxide. The cathode 208, is formed from MgAg and the protective electrode 209, is formed from Ag. The surface of the layer, facing the barrier layer, comprises Ag and does not comprise an inorganic oxide, as asserted in the Office Action.

Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, Ogura cannot reasonably be considered to teach the features as positively recited in independent claim 1.

Additionally, with respect to pending claim 2, Ogura does not teach, nor would it have suggested, a second electrode being made of ITO. Rather, Ogura teaches that the first electrode 202, is made of ITO (col. 6, lines 39-43). Ogura is silent regarding the composition of the cathode 208, or the protective electrode 209, being ITO. Further, Ogura does not teach that the cathode (second electrode) 208, or the protective electrode 209, covers the side faces of the electroluminescent layer 207, as illustrated in Fig. 2 of Ogura, and as positively recited in pending claim 2.

For at least the above reasons, Ogura cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or even to have suggested, the combination of all of the features recited in at least independent claim 1. Further, claims 2-12 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied prior art for at least the respective dependence of these claims on allowable independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recited.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the subject matter of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ogura, are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkheimer  
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:KDB/jam

Date: February 28, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--